

United States Patent and Trademark Office



APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/312,485	05/17/1999	PATRICE DEBREGEAS	065691/0163 2683		
75	590 02/11/2004		EXAMINER		
FOLEY AND			SHARAREH, SHAHNAM J		
WASHINGTO 3000 K STREE	N HARBOUR T NW STE 500		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
P O BOX 25696	•		1617	90	
WASHINGTO	N, DC 200078696		DATE MAILED: 02/11/2004	~/ */	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			A 1: 4:		A				
Office Action Summany		Application	No. Applicant(s)						
		09/312,48	35	DEBREGEAS ET AL.					
Office Action Summary			Examiner		Art Unit				
		Shahnam		1617					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cov r she t with the correspondence address Period for Reply								
THE I - Exter after - If the - If NO - Failu - Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAL INTERPRETATION OF THIS COMMUNICAL INTERPRETATION OF THIS COMMUNICAL INTERPRETATION OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERT	ATION. 37 CFR 1.13 nication. days, a reply tory period w II, by statute,	36(a). In no eve within the statu ill apply and wi cause the appl	ent, however, may a reply be time story minimum of thirty (30) days il expire SIX (6) MONTHS from to ication to become ABANDONEC	ely filed will be considered timel he mailing date of this c	ly. ommunication.			
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 October 2003.								
2a) <u></u> □	This action is FINAL . 2b)	⊠ This a	action is no	n-final.	•				
3)									
Dispositi	on of Claims								
4)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-22</u> is/are pending in the application.								
	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>1-10,21 and 22</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.								
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
6)⊠	S)⊠ Claim(s) <u>11-20</u> is/are rejected.								
7) 🗌	Claim(s) is/are objected to.								
8) 🗌	Claim(s) are subject to restriction	on and/or	election re	equirement.					
Applicati	on Papers								
	9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.								
10) 🗌	10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.								
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).								
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.									
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120									
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78. a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.									
Attachment									
2) 🔲 Notice	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTC nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Pape)-948) er No(s)		4) Interview Summary (6) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:					

Art Unit: 1617

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on October 9, 2003, July 10, 2003 has been entered.

Applicant's Group II claims 11-20 in Paper No. 28 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)). Applicant's election of species directed to mannitol as the core excipient and Gingko biloba as the plant substance has been acknowledge.

This application contains claims 1-10, 21-22 drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse in Paper No. 28. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancelation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

The specification does not contain appropriate subtitles with respect to different parts of the specification. Ex. Background of the invention, priority, etc....

Appropriate correction is required.

Art Unit: 1617

Priority

It is noted that this application appears to claim subject matter disclosed in prior French Application. A reference to the prior application must be inserted as the first sentence of the specification of this application or in an application data sheet (37 CFR 1.76), if applicant intends to rely on the filing date of the prior application under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) or 120. See 37 CFR 1.78(a).

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement ("IDS") filed July 10, 2003 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each foreign patent; each publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. No copies of item A2-A9 were found with the IDS submitted on July 10, 2003. Thus, it has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 11-20 to the extent that they read on the elected species are found to be free of art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 11-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 1617

The term "soft" in claims 11, 13, 17 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "soft" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably appraised of the scope of the invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 11-13, 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Franz et al US Patent 4,411,882 ("Franz").

The instant generic claims are directed to methods of producing a coated granules wherein the coated substance comprise a plant substance and the internal core contains polyvinylpyrollidone (PVP).

Franz teaches methods of producing coated pellets that meet limitations of the instant process. Franz teaches pellets having the ranges of 0.5-1.25 mm in diameter which is well within the instantly claimed ranges of particle size. see col 1, lines 61-66. Franz's core contains a polymeric substance such as PVP. see col 10, lines 39-50. Franz then coates the pellets with a layer of coating containing an ergot alkaloid which meets the limitation of the instant plant substance. *Id.* The coating layer of Franz employs an organic solvent which is a mixture of alcohol and acetone which meets the limitation of the instant fluid extract described in page 5, lines 18-25 of the instant

Art Unit: 1617

specification. Finally, Franz dry his granules by air or spray and sieve the produced pellets. (see examples 16-18). Such step meets the requirements of claim 20. Thus, Franz anticipates the limitation of the instant claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 11-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Franz.

The teachings of Franz are described above. Franz does not explicitly teach the use of fluid extract with specific concentrations of alcohol or the with ratios of the fluid extract to the mass of the granules.

However, it is well-established that merely selecting proportions and ranges is not patentable absent a showing of criticality. *In re Becket*, 33 USPQ. 33 (C.C.P.A. 1937). *In re Russell*, 439 F.2nd 1228, 169 U.S.P.Q. 426 (C.C.P.A. 1971). Accordingly,

Art Unit: 1617

Page 6

the art at the time of invention to optimize the concentration of alcohol within the fluid

absence the showing of criticality, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

mixture or the weight ratios of the coating per mass of the granules in the process of

Franz by routine experimentation.

Conclusion

No claims are allowed. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier.

communications from the examiner should be directed to Shahnam Sharareh whose

telephone number is 703-306-5400. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30

am - 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Sreenivasan Padmanabhan, PhD can be reached on 703-308-1877. The

fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned

is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-

1123.

NOSSELL TRAVERS
RIMARY EXAMINER

GROUP 1200

SS